Message

From: Manzanilla, Enrique [Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/13/2018 3:36:03 PM
To: mohsen.nazemi@dtsc.ca.gov; Lee, Barbara@DTSC [barbara.lee@dtsc.ca.gov]
CC: Herrera, Angeles [Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov]; Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Grant.Cope@calepa.ca.gov; Lyons, John [Lyons.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Final response to SF Chronicle: Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Importance: High

FYSA

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 7:55 AM
To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>; Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Cc: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: FYI - Final response to SF Chronicle: Hunters Point shipyard soil review

FYI - Final response to SF Chronicle: Hunters Point shipyard soil review

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:13 PM
To: Millner, Caille <CMillner@sfchronicle.com>
Cc: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Hi Caille,
Please see below.
Thanks,
Michele

Questions:

Q1 - What does "97% of survey units" mean in terms of clean-up? (Is that months, years, or just impossible?)
Q2 - Has the Navy responded to the numbers in the EPA's review?
Q3 - Did the EPA look at the soil results for areas where people are currently living/working on the property? (e.g. the artists studios in Parcel B, the new homes that were most recently built?)

Response:

Q1 and Q2:
The Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and will rely on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete,

though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech EC Inc. The resampling results will determine how much additional cleanup may be needed, so at this time we are unable to predict how long that cleanup may take.

Q3:
The Navy transferred Parcels D-2, UC-1, and UC-2 to San Francisco in 2015, and construction on new projects within these parcels is only allowed with a specific work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. As part of the review process for any new construction proposals, EPA and its state regulatory partners assess any potential concern about radiological exposure and any other hazardous contaminants.

For example, EPA reviewed the draft workplan for the new artists' building, part of which is located on Parcel UC-2, before construction started. We researched the locations closest to the artists' building where Tetra Tech EC Inc. had done trench and other radiation cleanup work. None of the radiological work that is in question lies within the boundaries of the artists' building work. Therefore, EPA has no concern about radiological exposure—or any other hazardous contaminants—associated with construction of the artists' building.

EPA also has previously evaluated the potential current exposure to radiation at Parcel A, where the new homes have been built. We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities. The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, and these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the shipyard. All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to

natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.